

From: [Gary Rubenstein](#)
To: [Nguyen, Thien Khoi](#)
Subject: RE: Guam: potential monitoring locations
Date: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 3:22:17 PM

Thanks!

Gary

From: Nguyen, Thien Khoi <nguyen.thien@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 15:21
To: Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Guam: potential monitoring locations

Hi Gary,

I just listened to your voicemail. Cleve will be responding to your inquiries and I have reminded him today.

Thanks,
Khoi

From: Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 9:32 AM
To: Nguyen, Thien Khoi <nguyen.thien@epa.gov>; Rios, Gerardo <Rios.Gerardo@epa.gov>; Holladay, Cleveland <Holladay.Cleveland@epa.gov>
Cc: Nancy Matthews <nmatthews@trinityconsultants.com>; Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Guam: potential monitoring locations

All – we have tentatively confirmed that we can get power to site 1 (the site across the street from the Mall of Micronesia), and we would like to proceed with getting access to the site and prepare a formal monitoring protocol for your review. Can you please confirm, subject to final review of the monitoring protocol, that this site appears to be reasonable? I've enclosed a KMZ file showing the approximate location, and four photos, all taken from the nominal site, looking in the four compass directions. The setback from Marine Corps Drive (the nearest road) will satisfy EPA requirements, and we'll confirm that in the monitoring protocol.

Gary

From: Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 14:58
To: 'Thien Khoi Nguyen' <Nguyen.thien@epa.gov>; 'Gerardo Rios' <Rios.Gerardo@epa.gov>; Holladay.Cleveland@epa.gov
Cc: Nancy Matthews <nmatthews@trinityconsultants.com>; Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Guam: potential monitoring locations

Khoi / Gerardo / Cleve – Enclosed are kmz files showing the locations of the two primary candidates for the preconstruction monitoring program. Site 1 is our first choice, but I'm not certain we can get power to that site. Can you please confirm whether either/both sites would be acceptable, and if both are acceptable, which site would be your first choice? We've confirmed that both sites should be acceptable under EPA siting criteria.

I'm on Guam today and tomorrow (Tuesday and Wednesday, Guam time), and can get additional information or photos if you need that.

Gary

From: Gary Rubenstein

Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 06:46

To: 'Thien Khoi Nguyen' <Nguyen.thien@epa.gov>

Cc: Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>; Nancy Matthews <nmatthews@trinityconsultants.com>

Subject: FW: Guam: potential monitoring locations

Khoi – This is the email I had sent to Gerardo last month. His preliminary response to me (about 10 days ago) was verbal, and he indicated that we should look for a location in “Area 2”, as close to the mall as we could reasonably get. Please let me know if you need anything further.

Gary

From: Gary Rubenstein

Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 10:16 AM

To: 'Gerardo Rios' <Rios.Gerardo@epa.gov>

Cc: Gary Rubenstein <gary@foulweatherconsulting.com>; Nancy Matthews <NMatthews@trinityconsultants.com>

Subject: Guam: potential monitoring locations

Gerardo —Based on the preliminary modeling we’ve done for the project, we’ve identified some general areas for potential monitor locations. The “overview” and “zoom” figures attached show the preliminary modeled concentrations of 24-hour average PM2.5 from the project (color scale is in ug/m3). The light green outline shows the assumed property boundary; the preliminary building and stack locations are also visible on the “zoom” figure.

The location marked “Area 1” is generally downwind of the project site. The areas farther west, where the modeled concentrations are higher (i.e. more purple), would also be good but look pretty forested so not particularly accessible or suitable for siting a monitor. Area 2 is the switchyard, which also sees some slightly elevated concentrations. It would be easily accessible and is closer to the housing developments to the south.

Any thoughts you have would be greatly appreciated.

Gary